

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/689,229	10/20/2003	Philip O. Gerard	LAC03 P320	4066
277 75	90 01/24/2006	EXAMINER		
PRICE HENEVELD COOPER DEWITT & LITTON, LLP			BELLINGER, JASON R	
695 KENMOO	R, S.E.			
P O BOX 2567			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49501			3617	

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1

Application/Control Number: 10/689,229 Page 2

Art Unit: 3617

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

3. Claim 16 recites the limitation "the at least one support post" in lines 1-2. There

is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. This limitation has not

been previously set forth in this claim or independent claim 10, from which claim 16

depend. Therefore, it is unclear what element of the invention is being referred to by the

phrase above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States

5. Claims 1, 3, 18, 20, 26-27, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Spiegel et al. Spiegel et al shows a composite wheel 14 having an outer

surface, a plurality of exposed apertures 38 formed in a circular pattern in a central hub

region 34 of the wheel, and a centrally located hub aperture 36 extending through the

wheel 14. A wheel cladding 16, with a body that substantially conforms to the outer surface of the wheel 14, has an exposed outer surface and an inner surface facing the wheel 14 when the wheel cladding 16 is attached to the wheel 14.

The wheel cladding 16 includes at least one alignment tab 28 extending from the inner surface for engaging the hub aperture 36 and aligning the cladding 16 with respect to the hub aperture 36. At least one support post 30 extends from the inner surface of the cladding 16 proximate the hub aperture 36 to structurally support the wheel cladding 16 with respect to the wheel 14. The support post 30 would structurally support the wheel cladding 16 with respect to the wheel 14 from any type of axially directed loads applied to the wheel cladding 16, such as loads applied substantially adjacent the hub aperture during wheel balancing.

There is a plurality of support posts 30 radially spaced about the hub aperture 36 when the cladding 16 is attached to the wheel 14.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 6-13, 16, 22-25, and 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spiegel et al in view of Van Houten et al. Spiegel et al contains all of the limitations as set forth in paragraph 5 above, and further discloses that a center cap

Application/Control Number: 10/689,229 Page 4

Art Unit: 3617

member covers the hub aperture 36 (see column 5, lines 16-19). Spiegel et al however does not specify the structure of the center cap member.

Van Houten et al teaches the use of a wheel 20 having a cladding member 60 covering the outer surface of the wheel 20. A cap member 80 is located within, and operably connected to, a centrally located aperture of the wheel cladding 60. The cap member 80 is operably connected to the wheel cladding 60 by a snap-fit connection. This snap-fit connection is obtained by a plurality of engagement tabs 82 that engages the inner surface 72 of the wheel cladding 60. Each engagement tab 82 includes a shoulder that engages the inner surface 72 of the wheel cladding 60.

Therefore from this teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the wheel cladding of Spiegel et al with a cap member of the configuration taught by Van Houten et al, for the purpose of protecting the entire outer surface of the wheel assembly (including the hub aperture), thus preventing damage to the outer surface of the wheel and preventing debris from entering the hub aperture.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 2, 4-5, 14-15, 17, 19, 21, and 33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/689,229 Page 5

Art Unit: 3617

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-33 and 35 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason R. Bellinger whose telephone number is 571-272-6680. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs (9:00-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Morano can be reached on 571-272-6684. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jason R Bellinger Examiner

Art Unit 3617

Jaso Bellenger jrb 1/21/06